

## **REMARKS**

At the time of the Office Action, Claims 8-20 were pending. Claims 1-7 were previously canceled due to an election/restriction requirement. Claims 8, 12-14 and 18-20 were rejected and Claims 9-11 and 15-17 were objected to. In this paper, Claims 9, 11-13, and 16-20 have been amended, claims 8 and 14-15 have been canceled, and claims 21 and 22 have been added.

### **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)**

Claims 8, 14 and 18-20 were rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,707,685 issued to Masanao Kabumoto et al. (“Kabumoto”).

With respect to the Section 102(e) rejection of independent Claim 8, Applicants have canceled Claim 8 and amended the claims previously dependent on Claim 8 to depend on either Claim 9 as amended and discussed below or Claim 11 as amended and discussed below.

With respect to the Section 102 rejection of Claim 14, Applicants have canceled Claim 14 and Claim 15, added new Claim 21, and amended the pending claims previously dependent on Claim 14 to depend on new Claim 21.

Applicants submit that the Section 102(e) rejections of the pending claims are moot in view of these claim cancellations, amendments, and additions.

### **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103**

Claims 12 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kabumoto. In response, Applicants have amended claims 12 and 13 to depend on Claim 11 as amended. As discussed below, Applicants believe that Claim 11 as amended recites allowable subject matter. Accordingly, claims 12 and 13, as depending on an allowable claim are inherently nonobvious. See, e.g., MPEP 2143.03 (citing *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988)).

**Allowable Subject Matter**

Consistent with the Examiner's appropriate determination that Claims 9-11 and 15-17 recite allowable subject matter, Applicants have rewritten Claim 9 in independent form including substantially all of the elements of previously presented independent Claim 8, which is now canceled. Claim 9 as presented herein does not include the term "hybrid" modifying the recited power plane. Although this term was present in previously presented Claim 8, Applicants note that Claim 9 as *originally* presented, which did not include the term "hybrid," was correctly indicated as being allowable by Examiner in a previous office action (the office action mailed January 10, 2006). Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 9 as amended herein recites subject matter that is consistent with the subject matter indicated by the Examiner as being allowable in the previous office action. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to allow Claim 9 as amended herein and its dependent claim (Claim 10).

Consistent with the Examiner's appropriate determination that Claim 11 recites allowable subject matter, Applicants have rewritten Claim 11 in independent form including substantially all of the elements of previously presented independent Claim 8, which is now canceled, with the exceptions noted below.

Claim 11 as presented herein does not include the term "hybrid" modifying the recited power plane. Although this term was present in previously presented Claim 8, Applicants note that Claim 11 as *originally* presented, which did not include the term "hybrid," was correctly indicated as being allowable by Examiner in the previous office action.

In addition, Claim 11 as presented herein does not recite "in substantial alignment with the power plane defined by the first and second cores" as was recited in previously presented Claim 11. Applicants submit that, consistent with the Examiner's indication of allowability with respect to previously presented Claim 15 (now canceled), for example, the cited reference does not anticipate the use of glass particles in the dielectric or insulating material of a printed circuit board. Because amended Claim 11 recites wherein the increased permittivity regions of insulating material include glass particles, Applicants submit that claim 11 as presented herein recites allowable subject matter. (Applicants have re-located the "in substantial alignment" element to newly added dependent Claim 22).

Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 11 as amended herein recites subject matter that is consistent with the subject matter correctly indicated by the Examiner as being allowable in the previous office action. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request favorable action with respect to amended Claim 11 and its dependent claims (Claims 12, 13, and 22).

With respect to the Examiner's indication of allowability with respect to previously presented Claim 15, Applicants have canceled Claim 15 and added new Claim 21 incorporating substantially all of the elements of previously presented Claim 15 and its base Claim 14.

New Claim 21 does not recite the term "hybrid" modifying the recited power plane. Although this term was recited in previously presented Claim 15, Applicants note that Claim 15 as *originally* presented, which did not include the term "hybrid," was also indicated as being allowable by Examiner in the previous office action. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that new Claim 21 recites subject matter that is consistent with the subject matter correctly indicated by the Examiner as being allowable in the previous office action. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to allow Claim 21 and its dependent claims (Claims 16-20).


### CONCLUSION

Applicants believe that they this paper contains a reply to every ground of objection and rejection in the Office Action and that this case in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request favorable action on the pending claims.

Applicants believe there are no fees due at this time, however, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees necessary or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-0383 of Baker Botts L.L.P.

If there are any matters concerning this Application that may be cleared up in a telephone conversation, please contact Applicants' attorney at 512.322.2680.

Respectfully submitted,  
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.  
Attorney for Applicants



Joseph P. Lally  
Reg. No. 38,947

Date: August 28, 2006

SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:  
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.

CUSTOMER NO. **23640**  
512.322.2680  
512.322.8383 (fax)